UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,320	10/07/2003	Cheon-Moo Lee	1572.1190	5224

21171 7590 04/05/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
KIM, HAROLD J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2181	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/679,320	**Applicant(s)** LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Harold Kim	**Art Unit** 2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Supervisory
FRITZ FLEMING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100
AU2181
4/3/2006

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01272006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the filing of the Amendment on 10/19/2005. The arguments have been considered but the arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. This action is made non-final.

2. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 17-20 are is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of applicants' disclosure, specification page 6, lines 6-7 and last two lines , the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., memories, processors, and ASICs) and intangible embodiments (e.g., any mechanism that provides transmitting information, electrical, optical, acoustical, or other form of propagated signals such as carrier waves, infrared signals, digital signals, etc.). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

To overcome this type of 101 rejection the claims need to be amended to include only the physical computer media and not a transmission media or other intangible or non-functional media. For the specification at the bottom, carrier medium and transmission media would be not statutory but storage media would be statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

In re claim 1, it is uncertain whether "a wireless network adapter" [claim 1, line 9] is second wireless network adapter or refers to "a wireless network adapter" [claim 1, line 3].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 8, 13, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima, USPGPUB No. 2002/0038400, in view of Seki et al., USPGPUB No. 2003/0063592.

7. In re claim 1, Fukushima shows a docking station [2 and 65 in fig 5] for a portable computer [1 in fig 5], which is detachably attached to a portable computer body [1 in fig 5], and the portable computer which includes a wired

network adapter [62b, 19 in fig 4] and a wireless network adapter [62a, 8 in fig 4], the docking station comprising:

a network connection part into which a network signal is inputted [65 in fig 5; paragraphs 0047 and 0049];

an Access Point part to generate a wireless network signal for a wireless network connection according to the network signal provided from the network connection part [67 in fig 6; paragraph s 0070 and 0074]; and

a switching part to allow the network signal provided from the network connection pad to be transmitted to the wired network adapter or the Access Point part according to an attachment or detachment state of the portable computer body and the docking station [figs 5 and 6; paragraphs 0056 to 0072].

Fukushima does not show the Access Point part to wirelessly transmit the wireless network signal to a wireless adapter provided in the portable computer body, and wherein the Access Point part is integrated within the docking station. Seki et al. shows the Access Point part [22, figs 4 and 5] to wirelessly transmit the wireless network signal to a wireless adapter [44, fig 5] provided in the portable computer body [21, fig 5], and wherein the Access Point part is integrated within the docking station [22, figs 4 and 5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the Access Point part to wirelessly transmit the wireless network signal to a wireless adapter provided in the portable computer body, and wherein the Access Point part is integrated within the docking station since it would provide user friendly by carrying single portable compute body instead of carrying two separate portable body and access point, and can improve the communication performance between the access point and the station since the wireless access point can automatically set up a free channel not used for communication as a channel [Seki et al., paragraph 0021].

8. In re claim 2, Fukushima shows the switching part allows the network signal provided from the network connection part to be transmitted to the wired network adapter provided in the portable computer body when the portable computer body is attached to the docking station [paragraphs 0059 and 0060].

9. In re claim 3, Fukushima shows the switching part allows the network signal provided from the network connection part to be transmitted to the Access Point part when the portable computer body is detached from the docking station [paragraph 0070].

10. In re claim 4, Fukushima shows the Access Point part transmits the wireless network signal generated by a transmitted network signal to the wireless network adapter provided in the portable computer body when the portable computer body is detached from the docking station [paragraph 0070].

11. In re claim 5, Fukushima shows the switching part allows the network signal provided from the network connection part to be transmitted to the Access Point part when the portable computer body is detached from the docking station [paragraph 0070].

12. In re claim 8, Fukushima shows a system [fig 5] comprising:

a network [65 in fig 5; paragraph s 0047 and 0049];

a portable computer [1 in fig 5], comprising:

a wired network adapter [62b, 19 in fig 4], and

a wireless network adapter [62a, 8 in fig 4]; and

a docking station [2, 65 in fig 5] to physically connect to the portable computer, comprising:

a network connecting unit to receive a network signal from the network [65 in fig 5; paragraphs 0047 and 0049],

a switching unit to transmit the network signal from the network connecting unit to an access point unit when the portable computer is not physically connected to the docking station and to transmit the network signal from the network connecting unit to the wired network adapter when the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station [figs 5 and 6; paragraphs 0056 to 0072], and

the access point unit to generate a wireless network signal from the network signal and to wirelessly transmit the wireless network signal to the wireless network adapter when the portable computer is not physically connected to the docking station [paragraph 0070].

Fukushima does not show the access point init is integrated within the docking station. Seki et al. shows an access point unit is integrated within the docking station [22, figs 4 and 5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the access point unit is integrated within the docking station since it would provide user friendly by carrying single portable compute body instead of carrying two separate portable body and access point, and can improve the communication performance between the access point and the station since the wireless access point can automatically set up a free channel not used for communication as a channel [Seki et al., paragraph 0021].

13. In re claim 13, Fukushima shows a method, comprising:

receiving a network signal from a network [65 in fig 5; paragraphs 0047 and 0049];

determining whether a portable computer is physically connected to a docking station [paragraph 0057];

transmitting the network signal to a wired network adapter that is included in the portable computer if the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station [figs 5 and 6]; and

generating a wireless network signal from the network signal via an Access Point part, and wirelessly transmitting the wireless network signal to a wireless network adapter that is included in the portable computer if the portable computer is not physically connected to the docking station [figs 6 and 4].

Fukushima does not show the access point init is integrated within the docking station. Seki et al. shows an access point unit is integrated within the docking station [22, figs 4 and 5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the access point unit is integrated within the docking station since it would provide user friendly by carrying single portable compute body instead of carrying two separate portable body and access point, and can improve the communication performance between the access point and the station since the wireless access point can automatically set up a free channel not used for communication as a channel [Seki et al., paragraph 0021].

14. In re claim 17, Fukushima shows a machine-readable medium that provides instructions [62 in fig 4], which, when executed by a machine [fig 4], cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

receiving a network signal from a network [65 in fig 5; paragraphs 0047 and 0049];

determining whether a portable computer is physically connected to a docking station [paragraph 0057];

transmitting the network signal to a wired network adapter that is included in the portable computer if the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station [figs 5 and 6]; and

generating a wireless network signal from the network signal via an Access Point part, and wirelessly transmitting the wireless network signal to a wireless network adapter that is included in the portable computer if the portable computer is not physically connected to the docking station [figs 6 and 4].

Fukushima does not show the access point init is integrated within the docking station. Seki et al. shows an access point unit is integrated within the docking station [22, figs 4 and 5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the access point unit is integrated within the docking station since it would provide user friendly by carrying single portable compute body instead of carrying two separate portable body and access point, and can improve the communication performance between the access point and the station since the wireless access point can automatically set up a free channel not used for communication as a channel [Seki et al., paragraph 0021].

15. In re claim 20, Fukushima shows a method, comprising:

receiving a network signal from a network [65 in fig 5; paragraphs 0047 and 0049];

determining whether a portable computer is physically connected to a docking station [paragraph 0057];

transmitting the network signal to a wired network adapter that is included in the portable computer if the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station [figs 5 and 6]; and

generating a wireless network signal from the network signal via an Access Point part, and wirelessly transmitting the wireless network signal to a wireless network adapter that is included in the portable computer if the portable computer is not physically connected to the docking station [figs 6 and 4].

Fukushima does not show the access point init is integrated within the docking station. Seki et al. shows an access point unit is integrated within the docking station [22, figs 4 and 5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the access point unit is integrated within the docking station since it would provide user friendly by carrying single portable compute body instead of carrying two separate portable body and access point, and can improve the communication performance between the access point and the station since the wireless access point can automatically set up a free channel not used for communication as a channel [Seki et al., paragraph 0021].

16. **Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima, USPGPUB No. 2002/0038400, in view of Seki et al., USPGPUB No. 2003/0063592, as applied to claims above, and in further view of Kabenjian, US Patent no. 6,834,351.**

17. In re claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, and 19 Fukushima does not specifically show the network is a local area network or an Internet. Kabenjian shows a LAN and an Internet to access a server. The LAN and the Internet are very well known in the art that a user access to a server via a LAN or an Internet to get information or process business transaction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to recognize that a network in the Fukushima's system is a LAN and/or an Internet because it is well known in the art and provides user friendly by allowing user to get local and public information.

18. **Claims 11, 12, 16, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Fukushima, USPGPUB No. 2002/0038400,**

Seki et al., USPGPUB No. 2003/0063592, and Kabenjian, US Patent no. 6,834,351, as applied to claims above, and in further view of Boyle et al., US Patent no. Re. 36,381.

19. In re claims 11, 12, 16 and 20 are Fukushima shows a docking port [41, fig 4]. The combination does not show a ground connection pin, wherein the switching unit determines whether the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station based on a state of the ground connection pin of the docking port according to attachment/detachment of the portable computer to/from the docking station. Boyle et al. shows a ground connection pin [ground pin, col 15, line 26], wherein the switching unit determines whether the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station based on a state of the ground connection pin of the docking port according to attachment/detachment of the portable computer to/from the docking station [col 15, lines 25-30]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have a ground connection pin, wherein the switching unit determines whether the portable computer is physically connected to the docking station based on a state of the ground connection pin of the docking port unit according to attachment/detachment of the portable computer to/from the docking station because it allows to cut power to prevent damaging the circuitry [Boyle et al., col 15, lines 29-35].

Conclusion

The arguments have been considered but the arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The centralized fax number is 571-273-8300.

The centralized hand carry paper drop off location is:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop ______
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the central telephone number (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harold Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-4148. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fritz Fleming can be reached on 571-272-4145. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HK
Harold J. Kim
Patent Examiner
April 3, 2006/HK

Fritz M. Fleming
FRITZ FLEMING
Supervisory PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100
AU2181
4/3/2006